

REMARKS

It is respectfully submitted that the finality of the final rejection is inappropriate for the reasons set forth in the Petition previously filed and attached hereto. Namely, the assertion of reasons for rejection of dependent claims for the first time in a final rejection is inappropriate. Moreover, the final rejection still does not reject or provide reasons for the rejection of each of the dependent claims. This makes it impossible to respond to the office action, be it final or otherwise.

For example, claim 13 is still not addressed. With respect to claim 14, it is suggested for the first time on final rejection that spinning on a layer is well known in the art. But nothing in any reference to date has shown such a thing. Therefore, a *prima facie* rejection is not made out and, to the extent assertions of commonly known are made, they are hereby challenged because it is not believed that spinning on a conductive layer over a photoresist is commonly done.

No office action to date has addressed claim 15. No reason is provided for the rejection and, therefore, a reason for patentability cannot be provided.

Claim 16 calls for treating a photoresist with an electric field generated by passing of alternating current through a coil. For the first time, in final rejection, it is suggested that claim 23 of the claimed application teaches passing alternating current. But he does not teach passing alternating current through a coil. Therefore, there is no basis for the rejection.

The rejection of claims 17-19 is not provided and, therefore, no further response can be provided. Since there is no basis for the rejection, the rejection is inappropriate.

Claim 20 calls for exposing photoresist to radiation and while doing so exposing said photoresist to an electric field. The cited reference merely teaches exposing photoresist to an electric field, but there is no discussion of exposing it to an electric field while exposing it to radiation. Therefore, there is no basis for the rejection of claim 20.

Claims 21-24 are not addressed and, therefore, should be in condition for allowance since no rejection has been posed or at least no explanation of any rejection has been posed.

Claim 25 calls for applying an electric field while baking a photoresist. Claim 25 was rejected based on the U.S. patent application to Nishi. Specifically, it is suggested that this is taught in claim 26 of Nishi. However, no attempt to address pending claims 26-29, dependent thereon is made, with the exception of claim 29. It is apparently suggested that because claim 26

of the cited Nishi application teaches light exposure he teaches every type of light, including extreme UV. The general cannot teach the specific and, therefore, there is no basis for the rejection of claim 29.

Claim 30 calls for exposing a photoresist to an electric field while developing an irradiated photoresist. It is suggested that this is taught in paragraph 45 of Templeton. However, no attempt to address claims 31-33 is set forth. The suggestion that something is a design choice is insufficient to make out a rejection of the claim. Everything is a design choice and, therefore, the pertinency of this observation is obscure.

In view of the failure to set forth objections to all of the claims and in view of the deficiencies of objections of those claims, the final rejection is premature and the rejection of the claims is unsubstantiated.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 7, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation